



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,655	12/22/2003	Robert May	1665/SYMBP182US	7594
23623	7590	12/01/2008	EXAMINER	
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP			ELISCA, PIERRE E	
127 Public Square			ART UNIT	
57th Floor, Key Tower			PAPER NUMBER	
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			3621	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/01/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte ROBERT MAY, MICHAEL SHLASKO, and JOEL KAHN

Appeal 2008-3970
Application 10/743,655
Technology Center 3600

Decided: November 26, 2008

Before ANTON W. FETTING, JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, and BIBHU R.
MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

FISCHETTI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants seek our review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 of the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1-34. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

SUMMARY OF DECISION

We AFFIRM.

THE INVENTION

Appellants claim a system and a method for obtaining data from an identification card, and more particularly to verifying an individual's age utilizing a scanner which generates a string of data which is representative of the age of the identification card holder. (Specification 1:5, 6, and 8:26.)

Claims 1 and 18, reproduced below, are representative of the subject matter on appeal.

1. A system that facilitates age verification of an individual, comprising:
 - a machine data reader that gathers age-related data information based at least in part upon encoded data existing on an identification card read by the machine data reader, the machine data reader containing a verification component that decodes the encoded data, extracts the age-related data information, and generates a data string compatible with a point-of-sale system based at least in part on the age-related data; and
 - a component that relays the age-related data string to the point-of-sale system, the point-of-sale system indexes the data string to a resident lookup table.
18. A method for verifying an age of an individual, comprising:
 - providing a machine data reader;
 - extracting data relating to an individual from an identification card via the machine data reader;
 - determining age-related information of an individual identified by the identification card based at least in part upon the extracted data;

generating a string that is received by a point-of-sale system, the string identifying at least one of an age and range of ages of the individual; and

indexing the received data string in a lookup table resident on the point-of-sale system.

THE REJECTIONS

The Examiner relies upon the following as evidence of unpatentability:

Rogers	US 2003/0178487 A1	Sep. 25, 2003
Carr	US 2004/0049401 A1	Mar. 11, 2004

The following rejections are before us for review.

1. The Examiner rejected claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Carr.
2. The Examiner rejected claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rogers.

ISSUES

Have the Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Carr on the grounds that the point-of-sale (POS) device and associated web cam in Carr are a system and that the image data extracted from encoded birth date data on a drivers license transferred between the web cam and the POS device is a string which contains information identifying an age of the license holder?

Have the Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Rogers on the

grounds that Rogers discloses indexing a received data string in a lookup table resident on the point-of-sale (POS) system?

FINDINGS OF FACT

We find the following facts by a preponderance of the evidence:

1. Appellants' Specification does not specifically define the term system, nor does it utilize the term contrary to its customary meaning.

2. *Merriam's Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (10th Ed.) defines system, inter alia, as: 1: a regularly interacting or interdependent group of items forming a unified whole as ... (d) a group of devices or artificial objects or organizations forming a network esp. for distributing something or serving a common purpose... .

3. Carr discloses using a driver's license

[f]or example, at check-in or at boarding, a passenger may offer a driver's license as a form of identification. An agent can swipe, scan, or otherwise process the card with a terminal unit, to obtain machine-readable data (e.g., steganographic watermark, bar code, mag stripe, RFID, etc.) from the card. This data can then be passed to the corresponding state DMV and used to authenticate the passenger.

(Carr, ¶[0043]).

4. Carr discloses the data derived from a driver's license

is parsed at the airport terminal device to determine the issuing authority (e.g., state of California). The device can determine an electronic address for that authority (e.g., by reference to a local or remote database) and then

electronically forward some or all of the machine-read data to the corresponding official data repository (e.g., the California Department of Motor Vehicles). A data server at that facility can check that a driver's license having the machine-read data has been issued by the state, and confirm same to the airport agent. This can be done by a simple OK/Bad message relayed from the state DMV and displayed to the airport agent. Or the state DMV may return a record that includes additional data (e.g., some or all of name, address, birthdate, eye color, hair color, social security number, telephone number, etc.), some or all of which data can be displayed or otherwise communicated to the airport agent. In still other arrangements, the data server may also transmit back to the airport agent a data file containing the photograph that was printed on the originally-issued driver's license, for checking against the photo on the presented driver's license.

(Carr, ¶[0044]).

5. Carr also discloses that a driver's license can be verified by the technique described *supra* (FF 2) so as to be

used in retail establishments for performing age authentication, e.g., in connection with liquor and cigarette sales (at restaurants, bars, convenience stores, etc.), car rentals, access to adult content, etc. As is conventional, the purchaser presents a driver's license to demonstrate age. However, instead of relying on a cursory glance by the clerk, the card can be verified using techniques like those disclosed above and below. For example, the customer can show the card to a web-cam associated with a point-of-sale terminal. The web-cam captures optically-encoded data, and the terminal decodes same. If the birthdate is optically

encoded on the license, it can be simply displayed to the clerk (or the presenter's current age, as calculated from that birthdate). If another identifier is encoded, it can be transmitted to the corresponding DMV server, which can return a message indicating whether the license belongs to someone above or below a specified age, or returning a picture of the licensed person. Image data from the web-cam (still or video) can be stored--either at the retail establishment or elsewhere (e.g., DMV office) as part of a transaction record.

(Carr, ¶[0059]).

PRINCIPLES OF LAW

Claim Construction

During examination of a patent application, pending claims are given their broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05 (CCPA 1969); *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. *E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp.*, 343 F.3d 1364, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted “in view of the specification” without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily).

Although a patent applicant is entitled to be his or her own lexicographer of patent claim terms, in *ex parte* prosecution it must be within limits. *In re Corr*, 347 F.2d 578, 580 (CCPA 1965). The applicant must do so by placing such definitions in the specification with sufficient clarity to provide a person of ordinary skill in the art with clear and precise

notice of the meaning that is to be construed. *See also In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (although an inventor is free to define the specific terms used to describe the invention, this must be done with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision; where an inventor chooses to give terms uncommon meanings, the inventor must set out any uncommon definition in some manner within the patent disclosure so as to give one of ordinary skill in the art notice of the change).

Anticipation

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 827 (1987).

ANALYSIS

The rejection based on Carr is affirmed as to claims 1-34. Appellants do not provide a substantive argument as to the separate patentability of claims 4-17, 19-27, and 29-34. Therefore claims 4-17, 19-27, and 29-34 fall with claims 1, 18, and 28. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii)(2007).

Arguments which Appellants could have made but chose not to make in the Briefs have not been considered and are deemed to be waived. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii) (2007).

Rejections based on Carr

Appellants argue that

the capturing of the data and decoding of the data
[in Carr] are performed in disparate systems - the
decoding specifically performed at the point-of-

sale system.

On the contrary, the subject matter as claimed in independent claim 1 recites a single device - the machine data reader and the components housed therein - as performing the data reading and decoding. Thus, the decoding does not need to be performed at the point-of-sale system as described in Carr *et al.*”

(Appeal Br. 4-5).

We do not agree with Appellants because Appellants’ arguments “...are not based on limitations not appearing in the claims ... ,” and are not commensurate with the broader scope of claim 1 which merely recites a system and nowhere limits the machine data reader to a single device, one and the same with a POS device. *In re Self*, 671 F.2d 1344, 1348 (CCPA 1982). A system is defined customarily as a group of devices which form a network especially for distributing something or serving a common purpose (FF 2). In Carr, the web cam and the POS device constitute components of a system because the two act in concert to generate a data string which is compatible with the POS device, and thus meets the requirement of the claims. More specifically, the web cam is disclosed as “associated with a point-of-sale terminal” (FF 5) and the two devices serve the common purpose of taking the machine readable data and generating a data string such that the “...web-cam captures optically-encoded data, and the terminal decodes same.” (FF 5.) In light of the breadth of the claim, the Appellants’ argument is not persuasive as to error in the rejection.

Appellants separately argue claim 2 stating that

claim 2 recites *the data string is substantially similar to a string generated by a barcode scanner upon reading a barcode*. This aspect is not taught

by Carr, *et al.* especially since the data generated by the device is a picture; hardly what is generated by a barcode scanner upon reading a barcode.

(Appeal Br. 5).

We disagree with Appellants because Carr specifically discloses scanning of machine readable data from the license in the form of bar codes (FF 3) and the data string decoded from the scanned bar code by definition would have to be substantially similar to that of a bar code. For these reasons the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Carr is sustained.

Appellants also separately argue claim 3 stating that in Carr, “... *the machine data reader comprising a component to identify items for sale within the point-of-sale system* as recited in claim 3 is not disclosed in Carr, *et al.* The web-cam device merely takes a picture of the consumer's license” (Br. 5). However, as found *supra* (FF 5), the system in Carr includes as components, the web cam and the associated POS device, and thus we read the POS device (which identifies items for sale) as a component with the web cam by virtue of the two devices working in concert as a system. For these reasons the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Carr is sustained.

Appellants argue claims 18 and 28 separately. Appellants maintain that Carr fails to disclose the limitation of “generating a string that is received by a point-of-sale system, the string identifying at least one of an age and range of ages of the individual.” (Appeal Br. 6.) Appellants reason that its “...string is a primitive type that is simply-deciphered and space-efficient, whereas the picture [string of Carr] is a large collection of pixels

requiring advanced processing to display, much less discern text from it.” (*Id.*) We do not agree with the Appellants arguments because Carr discloses that the birth date can be optically encoded on the license (FF 5). Thus, the data which is transferred from the web cam represents a string identifying the age of the individual. The image data transferred from the web cam to the POS device in Carr is in our view a string of bits containing data representing a birth date as required by the claims. In light of the breadth of the claims, the Appellants’ argument is not persuasive as to error in these rejections of claims 18 and 28.

Rejections Based on Rogers

Appellants argue, *inter alia*, that Rogers fails to disclose “...the point of sale machine indexing the data string to a look up table.” The Examiner does not provide a referenced section in Rogers to support the disclosure of this feature nor challenge this argument. Thus, we conclude that Appellants’ argument is persuasive as to error in the rejection of claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Rogers.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

We conclude that Appellants have not shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Carr on the grounds that the image POS device and associated web cam in Carr are a system and that the image data extracted from encoded birth date data on a drivers license transferred between the web cam and the POS device is a string which contains information identifying an age of the license holder.

Appeal 2008-3970
Application 10/743,655

We conclude that Appellants have shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Rogers on the grounds that Rogers discloses indexing a received data string in a lookup table resident on the point-of-sale system.

DECISION

The decision of the Examiner to reject claims 1-34 is AFFIRMED.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2007).

AFFIRMED

hh

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
CLEVELAND, OH 44114